UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,453	12/14/2000	Denise M. Genty	AUS9-2000-0599-US1	1927

7590 06/03/2004	**EXAMINER**
EDMOND A. DEFRANK	PATEL, HARESH N
20145 VIA MEDICI	
NORTHRIDGE, CA 91326	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 December 2000* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2.   Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is

old is illustrated. Figure 1 contains conventional hardware, page 3, line 21, which has been use

by the same assignee in the past. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or

corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the

application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker et al.

5,878,223 (Hereinafter Becker) in view of Horvitz 6,067,565.

5.   As per claims 1, 11 and 16, Becker teaches the following:

a learned preference prefetching system, method for using a client computer on a

computer network to prefetch a web page having a plurality of sub-pages in response to a request

by a user (e.g., a computer, e.g. a server or computer operated by a network provider sends one

or more requesting computers (clients) a most likely predicted-to-be selected (predicted) page of

information by determining a preference factor for this page based on one or more pages that are

requested by the client, abstract), comprising:

a prefetch module disposed on the client computer that allows the client computer to

retrieve web page (e.g., client computer requesting web pages and receiving predicted web pages

from the server, col., 2, lines 30 – 63);

a learned preferences prefetch module (e.g., server processing predicted selected pages in

relation to the client request page, col., 2, lines 30 – 63), in communication with the prefetch

module that determines that the user has a set of preferred pages from the plurality of pages and

uses the prefetch module to prefetch the set of preferred pages (e.g., server communicating to the

client, and sending selected predicted set of pages to the client based on what predicted set of

pages the client already has and what pages client may need, col.2, lines 30 - 63).

Becker clearly teaches about the concept of using the user preferences information to

create a list of pages that the client already has and a list of pages which client might need from

the server. Becker teaches to collect information whenever a user visits a web page, the

frequency and the number of visits made by the client in order to predicted pages. Using the

information on previously sent pages to the client, Becker teaches to save network bandwidth

and resources for updating the client with the appropriate necessary information. However,

Becker does not specifically mention about prefetching sub-pages of the web page.

It is well known in the prior art; for example, Horvitz teaches the use of prefetching

sub-pages of the web page (e.g., pre-selected portions or links of a web page, abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teachings of Becker with the teachings of Horvitz in order to facilitate

prefetching sub-pages of the web page because it would provide transmission of only sub-pages

from a server, rather than a whole web page. The motivation would be obvious because

Horvitz's use of handling individual sub-pages would help a client to inform server about the

sub-pages it received from the server in the past. The server will determine which sub-pages of

the web page are updated and it will send only the updated sub-pages to the client rather sending

the whole web page, as suggested by Horvitz.

6.   As per claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-20, Becker teaches the following:

the set of user-preferred sub-pages is based on the user's previous visits to the web page

(e.g., use of page cache, figure 2),

prefetching the set of user-preferred subpages occurs in an order dependent on a number

of times the user has requested each one of the set of user-preferred sub-pages (e.g., use of

probabilities, figures 5A and 5B),

determining whether an accessed web page has the set of user-preferred sub-pages

includes using learned user preferences including a history of the plurality of sub-pages visited

by a user (e.g., use of page cache, figure 2, use of probabilities, figures 5A and 5B),

the learned user preferences further include a depth of history that determines a number

of days previously that the history is used (e.g., The prediction approach may be extended to any

level of prediction depth desired for past days and number of visits by expanding the dimension

of the prediction matrix, col., 2, lines 31 – 63),

the learned user preferences further include a page depth that determines how many

sub-pages within the web page are considered distinct (e.g., The prediction approach may be

extended to any level of prediction depth desired considering the comparison of similarity or

dissimilarity of web pages, col., 2, lines 31 – 63),

the set of user-preferred sub-pages also contains additional sub-pages and sub-links

corresponding to the additional sub-pages (e.g., pre-selected portions or links of a web page,

abstract, col., 11, lines 18 - 38),

generating and storing the set of user-preferred sub-pages obtained during a user's

previous visits to the web page (e.g., collection of information for the use of prediction matrix,

figures 5A and figures 5B, col., 2, lines 31 – 63),

the set of user-preferred sub-pages is a unique list of user-preferred sub-pages that orders

the user-preferred sub-pages depending on the frequency of a user's previous visits to each of the

user-preferred subpages (e.g., collection of information for the use of prediction matrix, figures

5A and figures 5B, The prediction approach may be extended to any level of prediction depth

desired for past days by expanding the dimension of the prediction matrix, col., 2, lines 31 – 63),

prefetching is performed in an order set forth in the unique list of user-preferred

sub-pages (e.g., list based on history of client usage of web pages depending the number of times

the user made selection within certain amount of time, use of prediction matrix, figures 5A and

figures 5B, col., 2, lines 31 – 63, col., 11, lines 18 - 38).

Conclusion

7.   Examiner makes a very clear note that the rational of the applicant's invention has been

clearly taught by several references. The prior art made of record, including the cited references

of attached form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's invention does contain few minor additional matters that facilitate the concepts of

the applicant's invention. However, the additional minor matters are well known in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Haresh Patel

May 28, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100